

# MO Part C

## FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Executive Summary:

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

**Missouri Part C Infrastructure**

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) is the lead State agency responsible for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Missouri’s early intervention system, known as First Steps, is comprised of: (A) regional System Point of Entry offices; (B) a Central Finance Office; and (C) early intervention providers.

A. Regional System Point of Entry Offices: The State is divided into ten early intervention regions. The State of Missouri contracts with a single entity (System Point of Entry or SPOE) in each of the ten regions. The SPOEs are responsible for the local administration of the program, including referral, intake, eligibility determination and Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) development. All service coordination activities are provided by the SPOE.

B. Central Finance Office: The State of Missouri also contracts with a CFO whose responsibilities include: enrolling and paying providers; fiscal management; and conducting regular reviews of provider accounts to ensure providers continue to meet the criteria as qualified personnel, including completion of module training, a review of provider licensure, liability insurance and criminal history checks. The CFO also maintains the State's child data system. The CFO provides a support help desk to trouble-shoot problems with users, which helps DESE ensure accurate data are entered in the system.

C. Early Intervention Providers: Early intervention services are delivered by providers who meet DESE's qualifications. All providers enroll as individuals who are independent vendors or affiliated with an agency. SPOEs organize and coordinate providers into Early Intervention Teams (EIT). EIT is Missouri’s service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. Each EIT must include at least one Service Coordinator, Physical Therapist, Occupational Therapist, Speech/Language Pathologist and Special Instructor. The number of teams per region is determined by the SPOE.

The EIT serves as the main source of providers for families in the Part C program. IFSP services are provided using a primary service provider approach where one professional from the team, or primary provider, is chosen by the IFSP team to serve as the main support to the family. Families requiring services from disciplines other than those represented on the EIT (i.e., ancillary providers) will receive those services from other disciplines enrolled with the CFO.

**Lead Agency Staff**

DESE's Office of Special Education employs staff in the Early Intervention section who are responsible for implementing and monitoring the Part C program. The early intervention section consists of: (A) Part C Coordinator; (B) regional Area Directors; and, (C) compliance staff.

A. Part C Coordinator: The Part C Coordinator oversees the implementation of the regulations and contractual obligations of the SPOEs and CFO, and coordinates with multiple State agencies including other sections at DESE. The Coordinator is also responsible for the supervision of the regional Area Directors and compliance staff.

B. Regional Area Directors: There are five Area Directors located in State offices throughout the SPOE regions. Each Area Director provides guidance and technical assistance in the areas of child find, public awareness, SPOE operations, compliance requirements and best practice to two SPOE offices. The Area Directors also conduct annual provider trainings and monthly monitoring of provider billing practices.

C. Compliance Staff: There are two Compliance staff that conduct annual compliance monitoring, document any findings of noncompliance and verify timely correction of all identified noncompliance. This staff is also responsible for investigating child complaints related to the Part C program.

**WebSPOE Data System**

DESE operates a secure, web-based child data system called WebSPOE. The system contains all elements of a child's record, including referral, evaluation, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation. Data are entered in real-time and are accessible based on a user-level access in order to maintain privacy. The system is compliance driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice. SPOEs utilize the system to record child and family demographic information and enter authorizations for providers to deliver early intervention services. Providers utilize the system to record progress notes, submit claims for delivered early intervention services and review payment history.

Given the extent of data available in WebSPOE, the system has become an integral part of Missouri’s general supervision system. Staff in the Early Intervention section utilize the system to conduct compliance monitoring and service monitoring activities.

**Compliance Monitoring Procedures**

The ten SPOEs are monitored each year for compliance with SPP/APR indicators. The monitoring data reported in this SPP/APR were obtained through desk reviews of individual child records in accordance with the state’s compliance monitoring procedures. The desk reviews included information from both hard

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

copy records and data in WebSPOE. At least one randomly selected record was reviewed from all Service Coordinators with a minimum of six months of First Steps experience.

During the 2016-17 monitoring, if the SPOE had 80% to 99% compliance on an indicator, then the SPOE had an opportunity to correct the instance prior to a finding being issued. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs had to be corrected: (1) the child level, with each individual case of noncompliance corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) the SPOE level, with the SPOE providing documentation from new files, demonstrating compliance with the indicator. If the SPOE was able to demonstrate correction of both prongs prior to a finding being issued, then no finding was issued and no corrective action was required.

However, if the SPOE had 79% or less compliance on an indicator, then a finding was issued and a corrective action was required for that indicator. The SPOE did not have the opportunity to correct these instances prior to a finding being issued.

For all findings issued, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the regulations. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Area Directors and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

### Service Monitoring Procedures

All early intervention services delivered in the Part C program are subject to federal, state and local monitoring. As part of the provider agreement to deliver early intervention services and as part of the SPOE contract requirements, providers and SPOEs must participate in routine monitoring of the services delivered to families in early intervention. Providers are required to meet and maintain all standards, guidelines and policies for early intervention, including proper billing practices. Staff in the Early Intervention section conduct regular monitoring in order to verify providers are documenting and claiming services in accordance with State guidelines and instructions.

Examples of service monitoring procedures include a review of: the number of hours a day that providers billed for early intervention services; the number of missed visits; and complaints about provider billing practices. For each activity, staff in the Early Intervention section review claims and progress notes to verify there is sufficient documentation to substantiate payments to providers. Additional documentation to support the provider payment may be requested from the provider. Staff may provide technical assistance to a provider regarding recordkeeping and billing practices.

### Dispute Resolution System

The Missouri Part C complaint system includes three options to resolve disputes: (A) child complaint; (B) due process hearing; and, (C) mediation.

A. Child Complaint: A child complaint may be filed by any person or organization who believes there has been a violation of any State or federal regulation implementing Part C of the IDEA. The complaint must be filed in writing with DESE, Office of Special Education, unless it is determined the requirement to file in writing effectively denies the individual the right to file the complaint.

Child complaints are investigated by Compliance staff in the Early Intervention section. Decisions are issued within 60 calendar days of the receipt of the complaint, unless it is determined a longer period is necessary due to exceptional circumstances that exist with respect to a particular complaint, in which case an extension is made. If DESE, the SPOE or the provider is found out of compliance, DESE addresses in its decision how to remediate the noncompliance. If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the parts of the complaint being addressed in the due process hearing are set aside until the conclusion of the hearing. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to individual child complaints and track timelines for resolution of child complaints.

B. Due Process Hearing: Requests for a due process hearing must be made in writing to DESE, Office of Special Education. A Hearing Officer is assigned to conduct the hearing and issue a written decision within 30 days of the receipt of the request, unless the timelines have been extended by the parties.

If DESE or the parent disagrees with the Hearing Officer's final decision, either party has a right to appeal the decision to a State or federal district court. The decision of the Hearing Officer is a final decision unless a party to the hearing appeals. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to due process requests and track timelines for due process hearing requests.

C. Mediation: Requests to settle disagreements through mediation may be made at any time, including prior to initiating a child complaint or due process hearing or after a child complaint or due process hearing has been requested. Both parties must agree to enter into mediation and agree on an impartial mediator selected from a list of qualified and trained mediators maintained by DESE. If mediation is successful, then a written agreement is developed and signed by the parent and a DESE representative. All discussions during mediations are confidential and may not be used in any subsequent due process hearings or civil proceedings. Mediation must be completed within 30 days of the decision to mediate. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to mediation cases and track timelines for mediation requests.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### System Point of Entry Contract

The State of Missouri contracts with a single System Point of Entry (SPOE) to operate the Part C program in each of the ten regions of the State. The SPOE contract is on a five year cycle. The current contract began July 1, 2014 and ends June 30, 2019. Each agency awarded the contract employs certain staff, including a SPOE Director and a sufficient number of Service Coordinators and support staff to administer the program within the designated region.

On an annual basis, staff in the Early Intervention section review specific SPOE contract standards for child find, compliance, early intervention teams, IFSP meeting activities and a needs assessment plan. If a SPOE does not meet at least the minimum performance for each standard, liquidated damages are applied and a technical assistance plan is created to assist the SPOE with operations in the region.

The current SPOE contract contains requirements for working with families participating in Part C, including: (A) compliance standards; (B) transdisciplinary teams; and, (C) needs assessment.

A. Compliance Standards: Per contract requirements, each SPOE must comply with federal and State regulations for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and other laws or regulations related to the State's Part C program. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators, with help from the Area Directors. DESE conducts annual compliance monitoring to ensure SPOEs are implementing the regional program according to federal and State regulations.

B. Transdisciplinary Teams: Per contract requirements, each SPOE implements early intervention teams of providers to conduct evaluation and assessment activities and deliver early intervention services to families of children with disabilities. Missouri's team model was established using best practices for serving children in natural environments according to nationally recognized recommended practices. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to providers delivering services in the designated region, with help from the Area Directors.

C. Needs Assessment: Per contract requirements, each SPOE agency completes an annual needs assessment. The purpose of the needs assessment is to use data to identify the strengths and challenges in the regional system and identify areas that need training or technical assistance for Service Coordinators and providers in the region. The needs assessment may include observations of intake visits, IFSP meetings and provider practices in home visits. Each SPOE Director is responsible for using multiple data sources to inform any adjustments to the regional plan.

### Statewide and Regional Technical Assistance

Staff in the Early Intervention section provide technical assistance in two ways: (A) statewide technical assistance; and, (B) regional technical assistance.

A. Statewide Technical Assistance: Staff provide guidance and instructions to SPOEs and providers on various topics related to Part C requirements, including: timely services; parental consent; the 45-day timeline; and transition from Part C to Part B. General Part C information is available statewide through the DESE website, including written documents such as a practice manual and recorded webinars. In June of each year, staff in the Early Intervention section provide face-to-face training for SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators to reiterate requirements and best practices in service delivery.

Additionally, information related to evidence-based practices in early intervention is provided to SPOEs and providers, including: natural environments; home visiting practices; child outcomes, and effective transitions. Guidance documents on evidence-based practices are available on the DESE website. On an annual basis, Area Directors provide training to SPOEs and providers to reinforce best practices for serving children with disabilities.

B. Regional Technical Assistance: In addition to statewide technical assistance, targeted technical assistance may be provided to a region based on a collection and review of different types of data in Missouri's Part C program. The need for regional technical assistance may be determined from a review of quantitative data (e.g., data posted monthly on the DESE website, canned reports available in the WebSPOE) or qualitative data (e.g., surveys of provider or Service Coordinator needs for additional information, training or meeting post-assessments, concerns about the quality of provider practices).

Targeted technical assistance is not intended to be a statewide activity, rather assistance to a specific region based on an identified need. However, if multiple regions are having the same issue, targeted technical assistance may become a statewide activity.

Through placing high emphasis on scheduled, statewide technical assistance, regular data reviews, targeted technical assistance and problem solving, staff in the Early Intervention section provide a comprehensive technical assistance system for Missouri's Part C program.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

### Online Training Modules

The State has online training available to provide basic information about the Part C program. There are six modules in the training series that provide an orientation to the Part C program and address the process of assessment, identification of appropriate levels of service, family engagement and delivery of services in the natural environment. The online training modules are reviewed and updated on an annual basis to ensure the content is consistent with all federal and State regulations or State laws governing the Missouri Part C program.

Each module includes content, video, resources and an assessment to measure competency related to the topic addressed in the module. The modules are provided at no-cost to the general public; however, individuals enrolling in the Missouri Part C program as an early intervention provider or Service Coordinator must successfully complete assessments.

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Individuals enrolling as an early intervention provider are required to complete the first module, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to enrollment. Providers have six months from initial enrollment to complete the second, third and fourth modules. Modules five and six are optional for providers.

However, individuals enrolling as Service Coordinators are required to complete all six online training modules, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to accepting a caseload and conducting activities as a Service Coordinator.

### Transdisciplinary Teams

Throughout 2006 - 2008, Missouri explored various service delivery models and held numerous stakeholder meetings to solicit input from providers, Service Coordinators and parents. In 2009, Missouri began moving to a transdisciplinary team model with the award of SPOE contracts that included a requirement to assign new families referred to the Part C program to an EIT. The SPOE contract listed four benchmarks for implementing teams as a way to scale-up the SPOE's capacity to manage teams. In 2012-13 the final benchmark, 100% of new families assigned, was successfully met in all regions.

Missouri's current team model was established using the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like," a document developed by the OSEP TA community of practice for Part C settings. This document outlines the key principles and concepts for delivering services in natural settings as well as examples illustrating what the practice should "look like."

To support initial implementation of teaming, Missouri Part C staff developed five levels of training with the assistance of the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Dr. Robin McWilliam. The State used various pieces of literature to develop the trainings, including the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like" document and peer-reviewed journal articles about evidence-based practices for assessing young children with disabilities and delivering effective home visits. All five levels of training were disseminated using a face-to-face training format from 2009-10 through 2013-14.

The State recently used the content from these trainings to create a practice manual chapter for Service Coordinators to assist in implementing effective teams. The State is working on a plan to develop additional guidance for providers and online module trainings on effective home visits and evidence-based practices.

With the implementation of the SSIP in indicator 11, the State has expanded on transdisciplinary teams to allow professional development (PD) time during EIT meetings in pilot regions. PD time allows for 15 to 45 minutes of paid time in EIT meetings to be used for activities that can improve child outcomes such as: practices related to child outcomes areas (e.g., social-emotional development, appropriate behaviors, typical development for infants and toddlers), knowledge of local resources available in the community, and information about child development or developmental milestones.

The topics to discuss during PD time are identified by each EIT. Providers and Service Coordinators on each team may use checklists or tip sheets to use as visual aids. Teams are also allowed to have professionals outside the EIT attend as guest presenters to share information on topics that impact child outcomes (e.g., trauma, parent engagement).

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:** ☒ apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

When preparing the SPP/APR, staff in the Early Intervention section send a draft SPP/APR document to Part B/619 staff at DESE for review and input prior to dissemination outside of DESE.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which include parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers and State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2015 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

DESE reports annually to the public on the performance of the State and each SPOE compared to the targets established in the SPP/APR. The public report for each SPOE is compiled at the same time the SPP/APR is being prepared, and is posted within 120 days of the submission of the SPP/APR.

The public report for each SPOE, the Part C SPP/APR and other related documents are posted on the DESE website on the SPP/APR page at:  
<https://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2015 response

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.



(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		69.00%	81.50%	89.90%	90.40%	87.50%	91.50%	81.60%	87.10%	95.51%	97.25%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.58%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
		97.58%	100%	



Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

13

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated). In Missouri, services for infants and toddlers with IFSPs must begin within 30 days of parental consent to be considered timely. Timely services are determined by comparing the date of parental consent for the service to the first date the service was provided.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

-  State monitoring
-  State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data		96.90%	97.40%	97.90%	98.00%	98.20%	98.90%	98.90%	99.00%	99.34%	99.39%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	95.00%
Data	99.46%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	97.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See the Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction for a description of the State's procedures for soliciting stakeholder input.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	6,415	
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	6,453	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
6,415	6,453	99.46%	95.00%	99.41%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes**

*Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments*

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2009	Target ≥						68.40%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%
		Data					76.00%	69.10%	61.70%	74.60%	79.10%	79.89%	82.65%
A2	2009	Target ≥						53.50%	47.50%	47.50%	47.50%	20.00%	20.00%
		Data					59.40%	47.40%	41.00%	43.50%	38.40%	31.76%	26.81%
B1	2009	Target ≥						67.30%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%
		Data					74.80%	70.30%	63.80%	76.90%	80.40%	81.70%	84.62%
B2	2009	Target ≥						51.40%	45.60%	45.60%	45.60%	20.00%	20.00%
		Data					57.10%	45.50%	41.80%	41.30%	38.50%	33.67%	21.35%
C1	2009	Target ≥						72.00%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%
		Data					80.00%	73.00%	65.90%	78.20%	81.80%	82.48%	84.40%
C2	2009	Target ≥						41.70%	36.20%	36.20%	36.20%	15.00%	15.00%
		Data					46.30%	36.10%	32.50%	33.20%	31.10%	25.82%	26.75%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	69.20%
	Data	87.22%
A2	Target ≥	20.00%
	Data	25.97%
B1	Target ≥	70.40%
	Data	88.63%
B2	Target ≥	20.00%
	Data	19.18%
C1	Target ≥	73.10%
	Data	88.73%
C2	Target ≥	15.00%
	Data	26.26%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%
Target A2 ≥	20.00%	20.00%	47.50%
Target B1 ≥	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%
Target B2 ≥	20.00%	20.00%	45.60%
Target C1 ≥	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%
Target C2 ≥	15.00%	15.00%	36.20%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See the Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction for a description of the State's procedures for soliciting stakeholder input.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	3522.00
--	---------

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	50.00	1.42%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	335.00	9.51%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2342.00	66.50%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	580.00	16.47%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	215.00	6.10%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	2922.00	3307.00	87.22%	69.20%	88.36%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	795.00	3522.00	25.97%	20.00%	22.57%

### Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	61.00	1.73%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	281.00	7.98%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2580.00	73.25%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	509.00	14.45%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	91.00	2.58%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ .	3089.00	3431.00	88.63%	70.40%	90.03%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$ .	600.00	3522.00	19.18%	20.00%	17.04%

### Reasons for B2 Slippage

Missouri made improvement and met all targets for Summary Statement 1 for each of the three outcome areas. Results for Summary Statement 1 indicate children who enter Part C below age expectations are increasing their rate of growth by the time they exit.

However, Missouri had slippage and did not meet one of the three targets (i.e., 3b) for Summary Statement 2. Results indicate children may make progress while participating in Part C but are not functioning at age expectation by the time they exit. The State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data more accurately reflects the State's eligibility criteria since Missouri has a half-age delay in development (i.e., narrow criteria) and does not serve at-risk children.

Additionally, the State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data for Indicator 3 is a reflection of the data quality improvement activities conducted under Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). In Phase I of the SSIP, the state determined the collection and determination of child outcome ratings were: (1) not consistent within or between regions in the state; (2) not frequent enough to accurately report progress; and (3) not meaningful to the family and other IFSP team members. These three issues were determined to be the root cause for data quality issues in Indicator 3. To address the root cause, the State initiated a pilot project that includes new procedures for discussing, collecting and rating child outcomes.

The pilot began in 2012-13 with two regions implementing the new procedures. Another region was added to the pilot in 2013-14 and two additional regions were added last year (2016-17). Currently, five of the ten regions are participating in the pilot. The State examined regional data reported over the past three years and found a distinct difference between pilot regions and non-pilot regions. The pilot regions showed lower entry and exit scores, which is impacting the statewide data for this indicator.

As more regions are included in the pilot, the State expects the decreasing trend for Summary Statement 2 will continue across all outcome areas (i.e., 3a, 3b, and 3c) and targets may need to be adjusted accordingly. When the pilot achieves statewide implementation, the State plans to reset the baseline and subsequent targets for Indicator 3.

### Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	63.00	1.79%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	270.00	7.67%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2391.00	67.89%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	637.00	18.09%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	161.00	4.57%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age	3028.00	3361.00	88.73%	73.10%	90.09%

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).					
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	798.00	3522.00	26.26%	15.00%	22.66%

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	

Please note that this data about the number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program is optional in this FFY16 submission. It will be required in the FFY17 submission.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? No  
Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit, “comparable to same-aged peers” is defined as a rating of “5” on a scale of 1-5, meaning “completely (all of the time/typical)” in response to the question “To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?” A rating of “5” roughly translates to a 0-10% delay.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Instruments for Collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)

The State determines the appropriate tools to collect assessment results for this indicator; SPOE staff are not required to use a specific assessment instrument. However, SPOE staff must use three sources of information in order to collect ECO data. The three sources of information are parent input, professional observation and assessment results. In order to synthesize the three sources of information into a comprehensive summary, the State provides the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) form, which is designed specifically to address information relevant to Indicator 3 on the Part C SPP/APR.

After reviewing data from the three sources of information used to determine ECO ratings, the State decided to begin a Part C pilot project in 2012-13 to embed the collection of ECO ratings in IFSP meeting activities. In 2016-17 five of the ten regions participated in the pilot and exit data from these regions were included in Indicator 3.

Procedures for Reporting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)

Each eligible child entering the Part C program must have an ECO rating if the child has the potential of being in the program at least six months. A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely.”

For regions that are not in the pilot, entry and exit data are recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively. For regions that are in the pilot, entry and exit data are collected as part of the first and last IFSP meeting with the family. All Part C entry and exit data are entered into the electronic child record system, WebSPOE.

The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings. The State analyzes the outcome data at the end of each fiscal year.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2006	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
		Data		93.50%	92.30%	92.70%	94.60%	96.10%	96.80%	96.20%	96.90%	96.21%	98.64%
B	2006	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
		Data		95.60%	95.60%	95.90%	95.60%	97.60%	97.20%	97.20%	97.79%	97.86%	96.15%
C	2006	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
		Data		98.20%	96.30%	96.60%	97.40%	98.50%	97.70%	98.00%	98.62%	98.23%	97.64%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	95.00%
	Data	98.67%
B	Target ≥	95.00%
	Data	97.22%
C	Target ≥	95.00%
	Data	97.33%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Target B ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.70%
Target C ≥	95.00%	95.00%	96.40%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See the Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction for a description of the State's procedures for soliciting stakeholder input.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of families to whom surveys were distributed	6396.00
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	11.71% 749.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	737.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	748.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	725.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	749.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	731.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	749.00

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	----------------	------------------	---------------

# FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	98.67%	95.00%	98.53%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	97.22%	95.00%	96.80%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	97.33%	95.00%	97.60%

Was sampling used?   No

Was a collection tool used?   Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool?   No

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

In 2016-17, family surveys were mailed to all parents with a child in active IFSP status. If a family had more than one child in the Part C program, the parents received more than one survey. Parents were given the option to submit responses online or via mail.

The state collects three demographic items in the family survey: the child's age, the child's length of time in the program and the region in which the family resides. After analysis of the survey responses, the State determined the demographics of the families responding are representative of the families enrolled in the program. For both families responding and families enrolled in Part C, the average age of the child is two years and the average length of participation is 12 months. The response rate for each region is similar to the percent of children served in that region.

The survey instrument used in 2016-17 can be found at: [https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/dac\\_forms/MO5002988.pdf](https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/dac_forms/MO5002988.pdf)

The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

Yes

## Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0.73%	0.76%	0.79%	0.82%	0.85%	0.85%	0.85%	0.80%	0.80%
Data		0.71%	0.64%	0.76%	0.75%	0.84%	0.92%	0.97%	0.98%	1.01%	1.14%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	0.80%
Data	1.26%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See the Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction for a description of the State's procedures for soliciting stakeholder input.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	986	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	74,205	null
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
986	74,205	1.26%	0.80%	1.33%

Compare your results to the national data

Missouri is one of four states that have narrow eligibility criteria for children with development delays. Missouri is serving a comparable percentage of children as the other states with narrow eligibility criteria (Alaska, Arizona, the District of Columbia), serving 1.33% of the State's birth to 1 year population. Missouri is second behind Alaska (1.88%), and serving a larger percentage than the District of Columbia (1.11%) and Arizona (1.01%).

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			1.57%	1.59%	1.61%	1.64%	1.67%	1.67%	1.67%	2.00%	2.00%
Data		1.48%	1.37%	1.45%	1.55%	1.72%	1.96%	2.21%	2.23%	2.22%	2.41%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	2.00%
Data	2.64%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See the Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction for a description of the State's procedures for soliciting stakeholder input.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/12/2017	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	6,453	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016	6/22/2017	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	224,469	
TBD			null	

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
6,453	224,469	2.64%	2.00%	2.87%

Compare your results to the national data

Missouri is one of four states that have narrow eligibility criteria for children with development delays. Missouri is serving a comparable percentage of children as the other states with narrow eligibility criteria (Alaska, Arizona, the District of Columbia), serving 2.87% of the State's birth through age 2 population. Missouri is second behind the District of Columbia (2.97%), and serving a larger percentage than Alaska (2.64%) and Arizona (2.10%).

**FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		90.90%	95.10%	95.30%	95.00%	100%	96.00%	100%	94.00%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.21%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
52	56	98.21%	100%	98.21%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	3
---	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☒ State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
--------------------------------------	---	--	--

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

### FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE conducted the initial evaluation, initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting, although late, for any child whose IFSP was not completed within the 45-day timeline, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.



(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		60.10%	92.70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.40%	48.00%	89.47%	89.87%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

 Yes

 No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
75	81	100%	100%	92.59%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0
--	---


Reasons for Slippage

The State did not meet the target of 100% compliance and slippage from the previous year is due to six records found out of compliance in two of the ten SPOE regions. One record was out of compliance due to untimely transition planning and five records were out of compliance due to incomplete documentation of steps and services in the IFSP.

Upon a closer look at the five records that did not have complete steps and services in the IFSP, the State determined Service Coordinators documented *some* of the steps and services; however, *all* required transition steps and services were not documented in order to meet compliance for this indicator.

While slippage from the previous year is reported, the identified noncompliance was due to unique circumstances resulting in no pattern in Service Coordinator practices of a particular SPOE region.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

 State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.



(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		64.00%	90.90%	94.70%	98.60%	100%	100%	95.10%	84.80%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
80	81	100%	100%	100%

Number of parents who opted out <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	1
---	---

Describe the method used to collect these data

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

- Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes
- Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		57.00%	78.10%	94.20%	92.60%	91.20%	100%	100%	92.90%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
79	81	100%	100%	98.75%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	1
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0

Reasons for Slippage

The State did not meet the target of 100% compliance and slippage from the previous year is reported due to one of the ten SPOE regions having one unacceptable reason for the delay. The one reason was due to a Service Coordinator delay.

While slippage from the previous year is reported, the identified noncompliance was due to an isolated event, resulting in no pattern in the practices of a particular SPOE region.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0			0%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri Part C did not establish baseline or targets due to having no mediation data. If in a future reporting period the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, Missouri Part C will develop a baseline and targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	0			

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

MO Part C confirms there were fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**Actions required in FFY 2015 response**

none

FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target		71.10%	73.10%	75.10%
Data	69.10%	92.00%	89.50%	91.30%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	77.10%	79.10%

Key:

Description of Measure

Missouri’s Phase I, II and III submissions can be located in the State Profile.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri’s Phase I, II and III submissions can be located in the State Profile.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Missouri’s Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Missouri’s Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an  
5/9/2018Page 31 of 34

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

### Statement

Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

### Description

Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

## Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

## Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted



**Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)**

Description of Illustration

Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

## Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Missouri's Phase II submission can be located in the State Profile.

## Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Missouri's Phase II submission can be located in the State Profile.

## Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Missouri's Phase II submission can be located in the State Profile.

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Missouri's Phase II submission can be located in the State Profile.

### Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

### A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

This information can be found in the Phase III, Year 2 report, attached below.

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

This information can be found in the Phase III, Year 2 report, attached below.

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

This information can be found in the Phase III, Year 2 report, attached below.

### D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

This information can be found in the Phase III, Year 2 report, attached below.

### E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

This information can be found in the Phase III, Year 2 report, attached below.

### F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

This information can be found in the Phase III, Year 2 report, attached below.

## FFY 2016 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Stephen Barr

Title: Assistant Commissioner

Email: [stephen.barr@dese.mo.gov](mailto:stephen.barr@dese.mo.gov)

Phone: 573-751-4444